

that we would like to see . . . There are a number of other problems we have with a medical IRA that we think it will be found lacking in terms of where we would like to see health reform go."—US Chamber of Commerce

"[The MSA] proposal does nothing for cost containment . . . Once fully implemented, [the MSA] proposal would have enormous negative effects on Federal revenue. It would create a huge new tax advantage/subsidy, going mostly to the non-poor . . . It could have deleterious effects on primary care."—American Association of Retired Persons

"The likelihood that MSAs would be more attractive to healthy families indicates a potential adverse selection problem . . . In an unrestricted market, the difference in premiums [between traditional and MSA plans] would grow over time as the healthiest people in high-cost groups switch to lower-cost plans."—Congressional Research Service, September 1994

Advancing MSAs may be in the financial interests of a few, but Medicare beneficiaries are not among them. Shown on the reverse is the chief proponent of MSAs and some information on this insurer's operations.

Sincerely,

PETE STARK,
Member of Congress.

Insurance company advocating tax subsidies for MSA insurance plans: Golden Rule Insurance Company.

Percentage of Golden Rule insurance premiums going to medical claims: 65.2%.

Rating of Golden Rule's financial condition in "1994 Best's Insurance Reports": A+.

Stated reason for Golden Rule's A+ rating: "This profitability is attributable to the company's careful underwriting, its sophisticated claims system, and its adequate rate increases." (emphasis added; translation: "they don't insure sick people.")

Cites from information on Golden Rule Insurance Company contributions to Newt Gingrich compiled by the Office of Congressman Stark.

(1) Roll Call, August 18, 1994; Los Angeles Times, January 29, 1995; CNN, Inside Politics, October 12, 1994. Amount of reported contributions from Golden Rule Insurance Company executive to GOPAC, the political action committee of Speaker Gingrich: \$117,000.

(2) Roll Call, September 15, 1994. Amount contributed by Golden Rule Insurance Company to the Progress and Freedom Foundation, sponsors of Mr. Gingrich's "Renewing American Civilization" course: Amount not disclosed.

(3) Los Angeles Times, January 29, 1995; The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, September 24, 1994; Roll Call, September 15, 1994. Amount contributed by Golden Rule Insurance Company to "Progress Report," a weekly talk show on National Empowerment Television featuring Mr. Gingrich: Sole sponsor. Amount not disclosed.

(4) American Political Network, January 11, 1995; United Press International 1995, January 10, 1995; US Newswire, January 10, 1995. Amount of "soft money" contributed by Golden Rule Insurance Company executives to GOP National Party Committees (1/1/93-11/28/94): \$523,775.

(5) Los Angeles Times, January 29, 1995. Amount contributed by Golden Rule Insurance Company to Mr. Gingrich's 1992 re-election campaign: \$15,000.

(6) CNN, Inside Politics, October 12, 1994. Amount contributed by Golden Rule executives to Mr. Gingrich's 1994 re-election campaign: \$20,000+.

COMMENDING ALAN LEVY FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK AS AN AUTHOR AND JOURNALIST

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Alan Levy, founding editor-in-chief of the Prague Post and the 1995 recipient of the American Society of Journalists and Authors award, "Author of the Year." Mr. Levy's latest book, "The Wiesel File," is an extraordinary examination of famed Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal's life work and its enormous continuing relevance in today's world.

As an award-winning writer in the 1950's and 1960's, Alan Levy began to chart a career that would carry him and his family through some of this century's most turbulent and historically critical moments. Taking his wife and two children to Czechoslovakia in 1967, Levy found himself eyewitness to de-Stalinization and Alexander Dubcek's Prague spring of freedom, the Soviet invasion of August 21, 1968, and the fall and winter of Russian occupation and repression. Although the Levy family was expelled from Czechoslovakia in 1971, the experience was fodder for Levy's two monumental and critically acclaimed books on Czechoslovakia, "Rowboat to Prague" (1972), and "The Bluebird of Happiness" (1976).

Levy spent the next 20 years in Vienna, publishing award-winning travel and theater articles for the New York Sunday Times and many other world-renowned publications. Vienna also witnessed the world premiere of Levy's first play, "The World of Ruth Draper," in 1982. The play ran in Vienna, toured Europe, and enjoyed a successful 5-week run in New York's Times Square.

In 1990, Levy returned to Prague as founding editor-in-chief of the Czech Republic's leading English-language newspaper. From this post, he has provided the English-speaking world an unparalleled reportage and analysis of the radical, post-communist transformation of one of Central Europe's most dynamic and beautiful countries.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Levy's most recent, critically acclaimed work, "The Wiesel File," assures his place among the great writers and journalists of our century. On this day following his receipt of the Author of the Year Award, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Alan Levy on his accomplishments and celebrating his outstanding career in literature and journalism.

CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act:

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee report accompanying H.R. 961, the Clean

Water Amendments of 1995 (H. Rept. 104-112), inaccurately reports one of the roll call votes that was taken in the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. On the Mineta motion relating to unfunded mandates, listed on pages 199-200 of the committee report, the committee report indicates a yes vote by Mr. ZELIFF.

The committee records (included in the report filed with the Clerk) indicate that Mr. ZELIFF's vote was no on that roll call. Apparently a printing mistake was made in the printing of the report. An errata sheet to the committee report will be printed correcting this mistake. The final record will indicate that Mr. ZELIFF's vote was no on the Mineta motion relating to unfunded mandates.

CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act:

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

This amendment is intended to resolve a potentially serious conflict between two Federal statutes: the Federal Power Act, which gives the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] the authority to regulate hydroelectric generation facilities; and the Clean Water Act, which regulates water quality related to such facilities.

Being from the West, I have always been a strong supporter of States' rights. State and local governments, in my opinion, generally have a better perspective on local needs and desires than the bureaucrats in Washington do. So I generally have a fairly negative view of measures which would take away from the power of the States.

This amendment takes on this very difficult issue in the conflict between the Clean Water Act and the Federal Power Act. The current situation is not a positive one, with an unclear division of final decisionmaking.

As chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, it is clear to me that a clear decisionmaking process is needed. The electric power generated by a hydro project can often serve several States, over several hundred miles of transmission lines. Clearly, it is the role and the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure that this interstate system works efficiently and reliably.

Under the Federal Power Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is tasked with this role. It makes sense that, as with any other issue affecting FERC licensing, Clean Water Act decisions would also be subject to a process by which FERC would exercise its authorities in a consistent manner.

This amendment, I believe, accomplishes this objective. It retains a strong role for State involvement. I could not support the amendment if I thought the case were otherwise. It also clears up the current fog which exists between FERC and the States, and comports

Clean Water Act decisions with the clear intent of the Federal Power Act. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

SAM MEYERS—A POINT-OF-LIGHT FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1995

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute, local 259 UAW Union President Sam Meyers whose life represents a Point-of-Light for all Americans. Brooklyn and the 11th Congressional District are particularly grateful to Sam Meyers for his early and visionary sponsorship of the Brooklyn Coalition for Community Empowerment.

For over 50 years, Sam Meyers has carried the UAW vision of social justice and militant trade unionism in his union and political life.

He began his journey in the trade union movement in 1940 as a sheet metal worker at Brewster Aircraft and as a member of UAW, local 365. Soon after, he was elected shop steward, a position he held until 1943 when he joined the Army Air Corps. The Air Corps later assigned him to an orientation team whose purpose was to educate the troops about the U.S. war effort to destroy fascism.

In 1958 Sam led the successful fight to oust a leadership that had become too far removed from the membership, and to bring his brand of militant and democratic trade unionism to local 259.

From the time of his election as president of local 259 in 1958 to the present, Brother Meyers' passionate vision, leadership and tough bargaining have won strong membership support and involvement. Surrounded by a committed staff that mirrored the Rainbow Coalition, a strong, diverse, and well educated shop steward system was developed. The creative use of strikes, family and community support and solidarity picket lines helped win for local 259 members higher wages, generous welfare and pension benefits, security for their families, a nationally recognized mental health and occupational safety program, and dignity as industrial workers.

Sam led aggressive organizing campaigns, not only among the auto dealers, local 259's primary jurisdiction, but among low-wage factory workers who were predominantly women. Long before it became Government policy, the union under its president's leadership pursued affirmative action programs to bring people of color and women into union leadership.

Local 259 has been a recognized force in: the civil rights movement, the fight for affirmative action, the continuing struggle against racism; launching the careers and election of progressive forces to public office, including Congress members MAJOR OWENS, CHARLES RANGEL, former Governor Mario Cuomo and former Mayor David Dinkins, and challenging reactionary leadership and regressive social policies promoted in Congress and from the offices of New York's Governor and the mayor of the city of New York; The struggle for full employment, a guaranteed annual income, anti-scab and labor reform legislation, universal single payer health care, decent and affordable housing, and rigorously enforced occupational safety and health standards.

Sam served on the board of advocates for Children of New York, and helped to train parents and community activists in adapting union grievance procedures as a model for school based child advocacy. He initiated the first worksite child advocacy training program for parent members.

He brought the union into a partnership with the NYS Division for Youth and Advocates for Children to create an auto mechanic training program for youths released from DFY facilities.

In the late 1960's Sam was a cofounder of the New York Labor Committee Against the War in Vietnam, and challenged those in high labor positions on their support for the war.

In the early 1970's Brother Meyers helped bring national attention through congressional hearings to the impact of plant closings and runaway shops, as part of corporate America's wanton disregard of its workers at home and abroad.

There followed over two decades of the union's commitment to international labor solidarity. Local 259 championed the forces of liberation and democracy in South Africa, Chile, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Haiti. Scores of labor leaders fighting against oppression throughout the globe have found safe haven, support, and solidarity at Local 259 UAW.

Sam has treasured being an active member of the International UAW. Steeped in the UAW tradition, the union under Brother Meyers' leadership linked members' struggles in Local 259 shops and factories to the struggle for social justice and human rights everywhere.

In recognition of Sam's contributions to the UAW, he was appointed and served on the Commission for the Future of the UAW, meeting with regional representatives throughout the country.

At a recent UAW convention, Sam was selected to nominate Owen Bieber for president.

Sam's proudest legacy is the next generation of social visionaries and militant trade unionists whom he has trained and nurtured to assume the leadership of this great UAW local.

Sam Meyers represents a magnificent Point-of-Light and serves as an inspiring role model for all Americans.

THE REPUBLICANS' BUDGET HAS GOT IT WRONG

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget proposal can be summarized as gouging Medicare recipients, nursing home patients, and college students to fund over \$300 billion in tax breaks for the privileged few and to increase defense spending. This is not the formula to achieve a balanced budget. What it does is squeeze our middle class to reward those at the high end.

	<i>In billions</i>
Medicare benefit cuts	288.4
Medicaid benefit cuts	186.5
Total cuts	475.0
Transferred to:	
Tax cuts	353.0
Defense increase	76.3
Unnecessary new spending	429.3

Over one-third of the cuts in the Republican budget come from sacrifices that will be forced on our senior citizens in the form of reduced Medicare benefits and nursing home care. But their budget does nothing to actually reduce the cost of health care in our country. Why not rein in the insurance companies, the doctors, the pharmaceutical companies rather than take it from our seniors? Anyone who has studied the Federal budget over the years knows that the most important factor driving our budget deficit has been increased health costs.

I favor balancing the budget. I have voted for a balanced budget. I fight everyday to cut wasteful spending. The Republicans want to balance the budget on the backs of our grandmothers to turn over nearly \$350 billion in tax breaks to the rich and powerful. Instead, why not get rid of the "Benedict Arnold" tax break that allows a U.S. citizen who has made his millions here to renounce his citizenship and take his millions to some Caribbean island tax free. To balance the budget, health services are being cut for those who are most in need of our attention: seniors on Medicare, nursing home residents, disabled veterans.

MEDICARE

The best way to look at the effects of the budget proposal on Medicare recipients is to look at per capita benefits under the program. Republicans argue that there are no cuts in Medicare and that spending increases over the 7 years of their budget. This is a half-truth. Their budget falls far short of keeping benefit levels where they are today. Their future projections do not offset health insurance inflation, rising costs of services, and the 3.5 million more Americans who will reach 65 in the next 7 years. Under their plan even the current level of Medicare benefits will not be maintained into the future. Seniors will end up \$3,000 short. This translates into cuts in services, rising out-of-pocket expenses, and higher deductibles and copayments for every senior in this Nation—no matter how in need they are.

Medicare population increases: 37.0 million—1996; 40.5 million—2002.

Year	Money required to maintain current services (billions)	Money proposed in Republican budget (billions)	Medicare short-fall (billions)	Additional cost shifted to seniors each year
1995	179.0	179.0	0.0	\$0.00
1996	196.0	168.0	28.0	744.00
1997	217.0	180.5	36.5	955.00
1998	238.0	191.7	46.3	1196.00
1999	262.0	206.1	55.9	1426.00
2000	286.0	215.4	70.6	1773.00
2001	319.5	218.3	101.2	2523.00
2002	353.8	229.0	124.8	3081.00

The Republican budget will ration health care for millions of seniors while other Americans who are better off will not face health care rationing, but they will continue to pay ever higher prices for health care services because the fundamental challenge of health inflation is not solved.

For every senior, this \$3081-reduction over current benefits means the average American senior has to make it up, either by increased out-of-pocket payments, reductions in covered services, limitation of physician choice, or reductions in already limited physician or hospital reimbursements.

In regard to Medicaid, the Republican budget cuts Medicaid by \$187 billion over the 7 years and shifts the burden of caring for the